



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/731,912	12/08/2000	Eric Allan Bier	1508-3220	1180

7590 03/09/2004

Gunnar G. Leinberg, Esq.
NIXON PEABODY LLP
Clinton Square
P.O. Box 31051
Rochester, NY 14603

EXAMINER

TRAN, QUOC A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

3

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/731,912

Applicant(s)

BIER, ERIC ALLAN

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to application filed **12/08/2000**.
2. Claims 1-27 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 12 and 20 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 1-2, 5-7, 12-13, 15-16, 18, 20-21, 23-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated over Moody et al. US Patent No. 5,890,177 issued Mar. 30, 1999 filed Apr. 24, 1996(hereinafter '177).**

In regard to independent claim 12, '177 teaches, a document is collaboratively edited by multiple editors by providing each editor with a separate copy of the document, col. 2, lines 30-32; compare with claim 12 "*method for editing a group-editable web page comprising: selecting one or more portions of an electronic document*",

'177 also teaches, Each editor then edits his own document copy using an editing application program, such as a word processor, to produce an edited copy,

col. 2, lines 32-34; compare with claim 12 *"determining an edit user interface for the one or more selected portions; editing the one or more selected portions"*,

'177 also teaches, edited copies are consolidated into a single final document, col. 2, line 63; compare with claim 12 *"replacing the one or more selected portions based on one or more edited portions"*.

In regard to dependent claim 13, '177 teaches, three editors, col. 2, line 62; compare with claim 13 *"the replacing accounts for one or more edits by other users"*.

In regard to dependent claim 15, '177 teaches, a copy of each edited copy paragraph is displayed along with the corresponding original paragraph, col. 5, lines 51-54; compare with claim 15 *"the edit user interface displays a placeholder corresponding to at least one non-selected portion and the one or more selected portions"*.

In regard to dependent claim 16, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 18, '177 teaches, the special tag is "owned" by one of the editors. The editor who "owns" the special tag is determined by identifying the first revision insertion in the paragraph and assigning the editor who made the revision insertion the ownership of the special tag. If there are no revision insertions, then the paragraph is examined for the first revision deletion and the editor who made that revision deletion is assigned the ownership of the special tag. If there are no revision insertions or deletions, then an editor must have inserted an entirely new paragraph, col. 5, lines 59-67 through col. 6, lines 1-2; compare with claim 18 *"replacing one or more of the non-selected portions with a placeholder"*.

In regard to independent claim 1, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 12, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 2, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 13, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 5, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 16, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 6, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 18, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 7, is directed to a system for performing the method of claims 15, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 20, is directed to an information storage media for performing the method of claim 12, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 21, is directed to an information storage media for performing the method of claim 13, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 23, is directed to an information storage media for performing the method of claim 15, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 24, is directed to an information storage media for performing the method of claim 16, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 26, is directed to an information storage media for performing the method of claim 18, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody et al. US Patent No. 5,890,177(hereinafter '177), in view of Sidana, US No. 5,890,170 issued Mar. 30,1999 filed Feb. 28, 1996 (hereinafter '170).

In regard to dependent claim 19, '177 *does not explicitly teaches, " the electronic document comprises items, templates and remaining code "*, however '170 teaches, HTML home page template and scripts, see '170 col. 3, lines 4-21.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of '177 with '170. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination to utilize the automat feature of web page templates and remaining code, because, *In light of the remarkable and growing popularity of the Web among millions of users, an important challenge for technologists is to provide convenient, computer-based tools to assist users in the process of "publishing" (making available) their own content on the Web*, see '170 col. 1, lines 49-53.

In regard to dependent claim 27, is directed to an information storage media for

performing the method of claim 19, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

7. **Claims 14, 4, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody et al. US Patent No. 5,890,177(hereinafter '177), in view of Ken Pier et al. PARC WebEdit: Shared Text Editing in a web Brower. Pub Jan. 1996, on the web at:**
<http://www.parc.xerox.com/istl/groups/gir/doc/webedit/webedext.htm> (hereinafter Pier).

In regard to dependent claim 14, '177 does not explicitly teaches, "locking the electronic document", however Pier teaches, PARC WebEdit uses file-level locking, see Pier section Locking and saving, page 8 first paragraph.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of '177 with Pier. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination to utilize the feature of locking the electronic document, because, *it is common practice to "circulate" an electronic word processing document to several editors who then make their edits on a single copy of the document. With electronic computer networks, it is easy to circulate the document among the editors. However, the original author of the document maintains little control over the marked-up copy. Editors may delete insertions made by other editors or make other changes in an uncontrolled fashion*, see '177 col. 1, lines 57-64.

In regard to dependent claim 4, is directed to a system for performing the

method of claims 14, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 22, is directed to an information storage media for performing the method of claim 14, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

9. **Claims 8-11, 17, 3, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody et al. US Patent No. 5,890,177(hereinafter '177), in view of Bay-Wei Chang, In-place editing of Web pages: Sparrow community-shared documents. In the proceedings of WWW7, Apr. 1998, on the web at: <http://www7.scu.edu.au/programme/fullpapers/1929/com1929.htm> (hereinafter Chang).**

In regard to dependent claim 8, '177 does not explicitly teaches, " the element selection device permits selection of all portions of the electronic document that are associated with a given portion class ", however Chang teaches, The interview schedule is an example of a class of Sparrow pages, see Chang page 10, section 3.3 Interview, and also taught in page 13, section 4.4 Fields, Python subclass.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of '177 with **Chang**. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination to enabling the element selection device permits selection of all portions of the electronic document that are associated with a given portion class, because, ***the universality of the World Wide Web makes it a practical platform for collaboration: Web pages are accessible by***

any browser, and browsers are common on every computing platform needed to simply read the page, Chang taught in page 1, section 1. Introduction.

In regard to dependent claim 9, ***'177 does not explicitly teaches, " the portion classes include the class of items, the class of templates, and the class of remaining code"***, however **Chang teaches**, Sparrow provides flexible authoring for creating many different kinds of content. Sparrow items are specified declaratively, by creating a template that includes the fields that will be used and the HTML formatting around the field entries, see Chang page 11, section 4.1 paragraph 1.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of **'177 with Chang**. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination to enabling a group editing web page wherein the portion classes include the class of items, the class of templates, and the class of remaining code, because, ***the universality of the World Wide Web makes it a practical platform for collaboration: Web pages are accessible by any browser, and browsers are common on every computing platform needed to simply read the page***, Chang taught in page 1, section 1. Introduction.

In regard to dependent claim 10, ***'177 does not explicitly teaches, " a user may select and edit portions of the template class, while one or more other users may simultaneously edit portions of the item class "***, however **Chang teaches**, one user may change an item on a page without affecting other users who are editing other items on the same page, see Chang page 14, section 4.6 paragraph 1.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of '177 with **Chang**. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination to enabling a group editing web page wherein one user may change an item on a page without affecting other users who are editing other items on the same page, because, ***the universality of the World Wide Web makes it a practical platform for collaboration: Web pages are accessible by any browser, and browsers are common on every computing platform needed to simply read the page***, Chang taught in page 1, section 1. Introduction.

In regard to dependent claim 11, '177 ***does not explicitly teaches, " one user may select and edit portions of the remaining code class "***, however **Chang teaches**, WebEdit [6], WebWriter [2, 3], and Wiki Wiki Web all implement browser-based editing of Web pages. Like Sparrow, these systems allow one to edit pages directly within the browser, thus freeing the user from starting another tool or knowing where the page is stored on the filesystem. Unlike Sparrow, they require knowledge of HTML and editing occurs over the entire contents of a page, see Chang page 15, section 5 paragraph 5.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of '177 with **Chang**. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination to enabling a group editing web page wherein one user may change an item on a page without affecting other users may select and edit portions of the remaining code class, because, ***the***

universality of the World Wide Web makes it a practical platform for collaboration: Web pages are accessible by any browser, and browsers are common on every computing platform needed to simply read the page, Chang taught in page 1, section 1. Introduction.

In regard to dependent claim 17, ***'177 does not explicitly teaches, "unlocking the electronic document; and processing any user contributions stored in a queue"***, however **Chang teaches**, Pages are not locked during editing, see Chang page 14, section 4.6 first paragraph; **Chang also teaches**, When Web pages are jointly edited by more than one person, much meta-information about the page must be distributed in addition to its URL: who is currently editing the page, where the page is stored in the filesystem, who has permission to write to that filesystem, and so on, see Chang page 1, section 1. first paragraph.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of **'177** with **Chang**. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination to enabling a group editing web page wherein one user may change an item on a page without affecting other users may select and edit portions of the remaining code class, because, ***the universality of the World Wide Web makes it a practical platform for collaboration: Web pages are accessible by any browser, and browsers are common on every computing platform needed to simply read the page***, Chang taught in page 1, section 1. Introduction.

In regard to dependent claim 3, is directed to a system for performing the

method of claim 17, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 25, is directed to an information storage media for performing the method of claim 17, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Mori et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,040,142 issued-Aug. 13, 1991 filed-Jan. 27, 1989

Hanson et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,956,736 issued-Sep. 21, 1999 filed-Sep. 27, 1996

Van Der Meer U.S. Patent No. 6,405,224B1 issued-Jun. 11, 2002 filed-Sep. 1, 1998

Graham U.S. Patent No. 6,343,302B1 issued-Jan. 29, 2002 filed-Feb. 13, 1997

Weinberg et al. U.S. Pub No. 6,549,944B1 issued-Apr. 15, 2003 filed-Jul. 6, 2000

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-8781. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 2176

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic


Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Quoc A. Tran

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2176

February 27 2004


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER